REMARKS

Claims 1-2 and 4-12 were previously pending in the application. Claims 1-2 and 4-12 are canceled; and new claims 13-32 are added herein. Assuming the entry of this amendment, claims 13-32 are now pending in the application. The Applicant hereby requests further examination and reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and these remarks.

In paragraph 3, the Examiner rejected claims 1-2 and 4-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art (APA) in view of Brodeur.

Since claims 1-2 and 4-12 have been canceled, the rejections of those claims are now moot.

Support for new claims 13-32 can be found in Applicant's specification, for example, as follows:

Claims 13 and 23:	original claims 1-2 and Fig. 1;
Claims 14 and 24:	page 2, lines 23-31;
Claims 15 and 25:	page 7, lines 12-18 and 25-31;
Claims 16 and 26:	page 8, lines 17-19;
Claims 17 and 27:	page 8, lines 1-3;
Claims 18 and 28:	page 8, lines 3-6;
Claims 19 and 29:	original claim 3 and Fig. 2;
Claims 20 and 30:	Fig. 2; page 8, lines 26-28;
Claims 21 and 31:	page 9, lines 5-8;
Claims 22 and 32:	page 9, lines 30-31; page 10, lines 1-4.

For the following reasons, the Applicant submits that new claims 13-32 are allowable over the cited references and teachings.

In the rejections of the previously pending claims, the Examiner contends that a DC converter disclosed in Brodeur's Fig. 1 or 2 can be used in the integrated circuit shown in APA's Fig. 5 in place of voltage regulator **500** to produce an example of the previously claimed integrated circuit. For the following reasons, the Applicant submits that this contention does not apply to the integrated circuit defined by new independent claim 13.

Claim 13 recites, inter alia, a plurality of voltage meters, **each coupled to measure a voltage level received from the first power rail by a respective one of the circuit modules**.

First, the Applicant notes that Brodeur's voltage outputs Vout1 and Vout2 are independent voltage outputs (see, e.g., Brodeur's abstract, lines 1-4, and col. 3, lines 48-51), which means that these voltage outputs represent two **different and separate power rails**. The Applicant submits that Brodeur does not teach or even suggest that voltage outputs Vout1 and Vout2 can be connected to drive the same power rail.

Second, the Applicant notes that, in Brodeur's DC converter, the circuitry that drives voltage output Vout1 has a **single voltage meter**, i.e., comparator **38a**. Similarly, the circuitry that drives voltage output Vout2 also has a **single voltage meter**, i.e., comparator **38b**. Thus, none of two Brodeur's power rails (voltage outputs Vout1 and Vout2) has a plurality of voltage meters coupled thereto. In contrast, claim 13 requires a **plurality of voltage meters**, in which each voltage meter is coupled to measure a voltage level on the same (i.e., first) power rail.

Third, the Applicant notes that each of Brodeur's comparators (voltage meters) **38a-b** measures a voltage level **directly at the** corresponding **output** of the DC converter. In contrast,

claim 13 requires that each of the voltage meters measures a voltage level **received** by a respective one of the circuit modules and **not** a direct voltage **output** of the voltage regulator. As explained in Applicant's specification, the received voltage level is likely different from the direct voltage-regulator output due to a voltage drop along the power rail (see, e.g., Applicant's page 2, lines 23-31).

To summarize, Brodeur's comparators (voltage meters) **38a-b** cannot be interpreted as examples of the plurality of voltage meters recited in claim 13 because: (i) comparators **38a-b** are coupled to two different power rails; (ii) each of Brodeur's power rails Vout1 and Vout2 has a single comparator **38** coupled thereto, and (iii) each of comparators **38a-b** measures a voltage level directly at the output of the voltage regulator and not at the voltage-receiving circuit module.

For all these reasons, the Applicant submits that independent claim 13 is allowable over the cited references and teachings. For similar reasons, the Applicant submits that independent claim 23 is allowable over the cited references and teachings. Since claims 14-22 and 24-32 depend variously from claims 13 and 23, it is further submitted that those claims are also allowable over the cited references and teachings.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the Applicant believes that the now-pending claims are in condition for allowance. Therefore, the Applicant believes that the entire application is now in condition for allowance, and early and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Fees

During the pendency of this application, the Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge payment of any filing fees for presentation of extra claims under 37 CFR 1.16 and any patent application processing fees under 37 CFR 1.17 or credit any overpayment to **Mendelsohn & Associates, P.C. Deposit Account No. 50-0782**.

The Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to treat any concurrent or future reply, requiring a petition for extension of time under 37 CFR § 1.136 for its timely submission, as incorporating a petition for extension of time for the appropriate length of time if not submitted with the reply.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 12/22/2008
Customer No. 46900
Mendelsohn & Associates, P.C.
1500 John F. Kennedy Blvd., Suite 405
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19102

/Yuri Gruzdkov/
Yuri Gruzdkov
Registration No. 50,762
Attorney for Applicant
(215) 557-8544 (phone)
(215) 557-8477 (fax)